

REMARKS

In the Claims

Applicants amended claims 1 and 24 to incorporate features of claims 2, 12, and 22, and for clarification and antecedent basis. Claims 2, 12, and 22 were cancelled. New claims 26-28 were added. All of the amendments are supported by the originally filed claims, drawings (e.g., Fig. 1), and specification (e.g., pages 3, 5, and 7) and do not introduce any new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 and 18-25

Claims 1-16 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 5,581,924 to Peterson (“Peterson”) in view of US 6,632,042 to Liener Chin et al. (“Liener Chin”).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Peterson and Liener Chin do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 24, nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cited art to produce claims 1 and 24. Specifically, Peterson and Liener Chin fail to teach or suggest at least: (1) that the at least one identification medium, the insert, and the protective casing are joined to form a durable unit with a multilayered structure, and (2) an insert having high tear strength.

The cited art does not teach or suggest that the identification medium, the insert, and the protective casing are joined to form a durable unit. As an initial matter, Peterson fails to disclose an insert. See Office Action at page 3. Furthermore, Peterson does not join its information card 46 with other layers. Rather, the information card 46 can be removed from the pocket 42 via the access means 60 and the slit 62. See Peterson at Figs. 2 and 4 and column 3, lines 46-48. Thus, Peterson’s teaching contrasts with Applicants’ claimed element.

Liener Chin does not remedy Peterson’s deficiency. Rather, Liener Chin teaches away from Applicants’ claimed element because its binder pocket for printed sheets is not joined to form a unit. According to Liener Chin, the printed sheets can “easily be corrected or changed by printing another sheet of plain paper and inserting it into the sleeve.” Liener Chin at column 3, lines 24-28 and FIG. 23. Larsen also states that “the indicia 24 and information contained in the blank area 26 may be conveniently changed by removing the pieces of paper with adhesive backings containing old information and replacing them with pieces of paper containing new

information.” Larsen at column 5, lines 8-13. Therefore, instead of joining, Liener Chin discloses removing and replacing the paper at will and thus, teaches away from joining the identification medium, the insert, and the protective casing to form a durable unit as Applicants claim.

The cited references also do not teach or suggest an insert having high tear strength. Applicants agree with the Office Action that Peterson fails to disclose an insert having high tear strength. See Office Action at page 3. Rather, only the information means 44 is placed in the pocket 42, where no insert is provided. See Peterson at column 3, lines 29-32 and Fig. 4.

Liener Chin does not remedy the deficiency of Peterson. The Office Actions states that Liener Chin’s element 908 is an insert having high tear strength. See Office Action at page 3. However, Liener Chin’s “tabbed sheet 908” does not have tear strength requirement and achieves different functions than Applicants’ claimed insert. Indeed, the tabbed sheet 908 “holds the photograph 904 in place in the pocket apparatus 910 so it does not slide around from side to side or become crooked” and “provides an attractive border for the photograph and protects the edges of the photograph from damage.” See Liener Chin at column 11, lines 42-49.

In contrast, Applicants’ claimed insert has high tear strength. Advantages for using an insert having high tear strength include, for example, that the insert “absorbs all of the tensile and bending forces acting on the information medium and prevents the various layers of the information medium from becoming damaged by these forces.” See originally filed specification at page 3. An insert having high tear strength also allows that “[e]ach identification medium may be selected without taking into account a specific strength required for permanent attachment, as it is protected from premature destruction by the insert having high tear strength.” *Id.* Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the claimed insert having high tear strength has different mechanical properties and achieves different functions than Liener Chin’s tabbed sheet 908.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 24 are patentable over Peterson and Liener Chin. Claims 2-16, 18-23 and 25 depend upon claim 1 and thus are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-25 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 17

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peterson and Liener Chin as applied to claim 1, and further in view of US 4,773,175 to Larsen (“Larsen”).

Claim 17 depends upon claim 1. For the reasons discussed above, Peterson and Liener Chin do not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Larsen does not cure the deficiencies of Peterson and Liener Chin. Rather, Larsen is cited solely as disclosing that the identification medium is a transponder. See Office Action at page 5. Thus, the combination of the references still fails to teach, suggest, or make obvious claim 1, as well as its dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims 26, 27, and 28

New claim 26 depends upon claim 1 and recites “the strap for fastening, securing or clamping goods or a person comprises multiple sections connected by a web.” It is respectfully submitted that during the 01/29/2010 Examiner Interview, the Examiner indicated that a point of novelty may be a strap comprising multiple sections connected with a web. See Examiner’s Interview Summary dated 02/08/2010 and Applicants’ Statement of the Substance of the Interview dated 03/05/2010. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of new claim 26.


New claims 27 and 28 depend upon claims 1 and 24, respectively, and recite “the at least one identification medium, the insert, and the protective casing are permanently joined to form the durable unit.” As discussed above, none of the cited references teach or suggest joining the at least one identification medium, the insert, and the protective casing. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cited art so as to permanently join the different layers, because Peterson and Liener Chin provide the opposite, incompatible teaching, i.e., that the information can be removed and replaced. For this additional reason, the cited art does not teach, suggest, or make obvious claims 27 and 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action. If the Examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is welcome to contact Applicants' Agent at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 3, 2010


Isaac A. Hubner, Reg. No. 61,393
Attorney for the Applicants
Proskauer Rose LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Tel. No. (617) 526-9893
ihubner@proskauer.com